

### **REMARKS**

Applicants hereby request further consideration of the application in view of the amendments above and the comments that follow.

### **Status of the Claims**

Claims 1-3 stand rejected under Section 102(b) as being anticipated by U.K. Patent Application GB 2 322 504 to Frederick Yi-Tung Cho (Cho). New Claims 4 and 5 have been added by the foregoing amendments.

### **The Rejections under Section 102**

Claim 1 as amended combines the features of previous Claims 1, 2, 3 and 4, and further recites that "said first part of said rotating structure is connected to said at least one fixed structure in a non-rotatable manner and said second part of said rotating structure is connected to said lower casing in a non-rotatable manner." Exemplary corresponding features are disclosed at page 5, lines 10-15, of the original specification, for example.

Applicants respectfully submit that Cho does not disclose a mobile terminal as now recited in Claim 1. In relation to previous Claims 2, 3 and 4, the Action cites to **Figures 1 and 3** as well as page 4, lines 10-16, and page 7, lines 7-15 of Cho. However, Cho does not disclose the specific structure of the hinge mechanism as defined in Claim 1 as amended. Particularly, **Figures 1 and 3** of Cho do not disclose the specific internal structure of the hinge mechanism at all. In page 4, lines 10-16, it is only described that the bottom housing portion **103** rotates via a second hinge **113** to close over display **105** in central housing portion **102**. Therefore, this part of the disclosure only discloses the normal functionality of a hinge mechanism, namely the rotation of one element over or around another element. However, this part does not disclose anything about the specific structure of the hinge mechanism. Page 7, lines 7-15, and **Figure 8**, to which this part of the disclosure relates, disclose specific construction of the hinge **218** with openings through which wires electrically connecting the different parts of the cellular phone may extend. Further, page 7, lines 23-29, which relates to **Figure 9**, discloses a specific construction of the hinge **216**, whereby the

hinge comprises a top member **901** and a bottom member **902**, which are snapped together. Thus, the top member and the bottom member of the hinge **216** are connected in a non-rotatable manner. Otherwise, Cho does not disclose anything about the specific structure of the hinge mechanism. Specifically, Cho does not disclose the specific structure of the hinge mechanism which enables a rotation of the different parts of the cellular phone around each other. Although it is understood that a hinge always provides a rotating function, Cho does not disclose how the rotating function is realized. Cho only discloses how the hinge mechanism should be constructed in order to enable the connection of wires between the different parts of the cellular phone.

By contrast, the specific construction of the hinge mechanism of the present invention as recited in Claim 1 as amended provides a simple but very effective possibility of rotatably connecting an upper casing and a lower casing of a clam shell type mobile terminal with each other. This simple but very effective hinge mechanism of the present invention enables a stable rotatable connection of the lower casing and the upper casing while ensuring that the specific spatial relationship between the lower casing and the upper casing is maintained in order to enable a user with an easy access and operation of input keys that are located close to the hinge mechanism on the lower casing. Accordingly, Claim 1 as amended is therefore not only novel but also nonobvious in view of the prior art.

Applicants further incorporate Applicants' arguments as set forth in Applicants' Amendment and Response dated April 4, 2007.


The foregoing amendments are made without prejudice to Applicants' right to file a continuation or continuation-in-part application directed to the subject matter of the rejected claims. The claim amendments are intended for the purpose of expediting issuance of a patent directed to the subject matter of the claims as amended, and such amendments are not to be considered a representation, concession or acquiescence as to the patentability of the claims as presented prior to the amendments.

In re: Wada et al.  
Serial No.: 10/550,034  
Filed: June 19, 2006  
Page 6 of 6

**CONCLUSION**

Applicants respectfully submit that this application is now in condition for allowance, which action is requested. Should the Examiner have any matters outstanding of resolution, he is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at 919-854-1400 for expeditious handling.


Respectfully submitted,

  
David D. Beatty  
Registration No. 38,071  
Attorney for Applicants

**USPTO Customer No. 54414**  
Myers Bigel Sibley & Sajovec, P.A.  
Post Office Box 37428  
Raleigh, North Carolina 27627  
Telephone: (919) 854-1400  
Facsimile: (919) 854-1401

**CERTIFICATION OF ELECTRONIC TRANSMISSION**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted via the Office electronic filing system in accordance with § 1.6(a)(4) to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office on July 27, 2007.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Katie Wu  
Date of Signature: July 27, 2007